

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
John C. Harvey *et al.*

Application No.: 08/487,526

Filed: June 7, 1995

For: SIGNAL PROCESSING APPARATUS AND
METHODS

Confirmation No.: 7792

Art Unit: 2628

Examiner: Pappas, Peter-Anthony

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir or Madam:

Pursuant to item 4 on page 3 of the February 25th, 2010 Notice of Allowance in the above captioned application, Applicants hereby submit the following interview summaries that are relevant to the allowance of this application.

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS

May 4, 2009

The prosecution of this application, along with all but two of Applicants' copending application, was suspended for several years pending the outcome of the appeal of Application Serial Nos. 08/470,571 and 08/487,526 and the reexamination proceedings of seven related patents. Applicants inquired into the status of these applications in January, 2009, as the current six-month suspension period expired. Applicants requested that the suspension of these applications not be renewed. The Office, through Supervisory Examiner David L. Ometz indicated that the suspensions would not be renewed and that prosecution would recommence. Applicants wish to thank Examiner David L. Ometz for the courtesy of the interview held on May 4, 2009 in which Applicants' representatives and the Examiners discussed an overall plan for examination of the remaining 110 applications which relate to this application and have a

common chain of priority. Applicants were informed that the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) was developing a plan to resume examination and that Applicants would be informed when the plan was in place.

July 22, 2009

Applicants were informed in July, 2009, that a team of examiners had been assembled to examine Applicants' copending applications. Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' Representatives in a meeting held July 22, 2009, with the examination team. In attendance at the meeting were Thomas J. Scott, Jr. and Carl L. Benson, of Goodwin Procter and the PTO personnel identified on the attached list. Applicants' representatives made a presentation to the Examiners in attendance in accordance with the attached agenda and provided the materials attached hereto to the Examiners for their consideration and use in the further examination of this application and the other application related to this application as identified in Tab 2 of the materials provided to the Examiners in the meeting. Applicants' representatives agreed to respond to any telephone inquiries or to be present for personal interview at the PTO in any circumstance where the Examiner believed such an interview would advance the prosecution of this application.

January 6 – February 14, 2010

Applicants representatives and Examiner Pappas held a series of telephone interviews spanning from January 6 through February 14, 2010 in which the amendments resulting in allowance were proposed and refined. Examiner Pappas asserted that the closest art of which he was aware relevant to the claim amendment was the article *Telesoftware – Value Added Teletext*, by J. Hedger *et al.*, IEEE Transactions on Consumer Electronics, Vol. CE-26, Aug. 1980 and U.S. Patents 4,455,570 and 3,848,082. Examiner Pappas agreed that the amendments clarifying the claim limitations avoid the prior art for the reasons set forth in the Notice of Allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's time and consideration in this matter.

Dated: March 9, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /Thomas J. Scott, Jr./
Thomas J. Scott, Jr.

Registration No.: 27,836
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 346-4000
Attorney for Applicants